

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V. CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:24-CR-97-KHJ-LGI-1

LENNELL ANTONIO MOORE, JR.

ORDER

Before the Court are the United States' [39, 52] Motions in Limine. The Government moves to exclude evidence of the following matters at trial:

- “[t]he presence or absence of any particular person on the Government’s witness list, or the Government’s plan to call or not call a particular witness,” [39] at 1;
- “[t]he use of interview reports prepared by law enforcement to impeach Government witnesses or otherwise improper use of the reports,” *id.* at 2;
- “[a]ny out-of-court statements made by [Moore] or any other person if offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted,” *id.* at 5;
- “[d]isputes over discovery, including the timing of the production of records to the Government by witnesses,” *id.*;
- “[a]ny suggestion or accusation that a prosecutor or agent or any law enforcement official engaged in misconduct,” *id.* at 6;
- “[w]hich other persons have, or have not, been charged in this or other cases,” *id.*;
- “[a]ny argument that encourages jurors to ignore the law, not follow this Court’s instructions, or otherwise violate their oaths as jurors,” *id.*;
- “[p]otential punishment or any other consequences that might result from a conviction,” *id.* at 7;
- “[d]efense counsel’s personal opinions of, or relationship with, [Moore],” *id.*;

- “[s]pecific instances of prior good acts,” *id.*;
- “[t]he existence or content of the Government’s motions and any order of this Court in response to those motions,” *id.* at 8; and
- “any evidence . . . that was not previously produced to the Government as required by the discovery order . . . .” [52] at 1; *see also* Order Regarding Discovery [10] at 2.

Moore did not respond to either motion within 11 days. *See* L.U. Crim. R. 47(C)(1).

“For any motion other than a dispositive motion or a motion for post-conviction relief, the [C]ourt may grant the motion as unopposed if a party fails to respond or provide notice of its intent not to respond within the time allotted.” *Id.* Thus, the Court GRANTS the United States’ [39, 52] Motions in Limine as unopposed.<sup>1</sup>

SO ORDERED, this 9th day of April, 2025.

*s/ Kristi H. Johnson*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> “An order granting a motion in limine does not preclude the losing party from revisiting the issue at trial, outside the jury’s presence.” *United States v. Bryan*, No. 3:21-CR-17, 2023 WL 8100552, at \*1 (S.D. Miss. Nov. 21, 2023).